DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 756 EC 061 920

TITLE	Basic Education Rights for the Handicapped. 1973 Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-73-24000
PUB DATE	30 Jun 73
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (Stock Number 1780-01217, $0.55)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annual Reports; *Educational Programs; *Exceptional Child Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Government Role; Handicapped Children; Program Development

ABSTRACT

Presented in the annual report for 1973 by the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children are a review of the administration and operation of federally sponsored educational programs for handicapped children and adults, and recommendations for priorities and future programs. Noted is authorization of the advisory committee by Public Law (P.L.) 89-750, and listed are committee members. Reviewed in the introduction are the history of Federal efforts including a 10-fold appropriation increase in 10 years to support education for the handicapped, and priority goals for education of all handicapped children by 1980. Listed are priority recommendations such as clearly identifying and earmarking Federal assistance to States for education of the handicapped. A review of activities and programs under the Education for the Handicapped Act (P.L. 91-230) focuses on highlights of fiscal year 1973, professional preparation, and telecommunications. Activities of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped are seen to include giving aid to State education agencies, providing support for 10 regional deaf/blind centers in the U. S., stimulating early childhood education centers, changing procedures to development of more professional preparation, supporting research and demonstration projects on intervention, fostering media services and captioned films, and supporting learning disabilities centers in 40 states. It is recommended that new legislation include factors such as nondiscriminatory testing, and that attention be given to accountability, increased financing, and continuing problems such as institutional reform (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 090756

EC

BASIC EDUCATION RIGHTS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

1973 Annual Report

The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children

EC084420

ED 090756

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 73-24000

Basic Education Rights for the Handicapped

1973 ANNUAL REPORT
of the
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

June 30, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary
S. P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education
John Ottina, Commissioner

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1973

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price: 55 cents
Stock Number 1780–01217

R. M. N. CROSBY, M. D.
1010 ST. PAUL STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202

VERNON 7-0404

PEDIATRIC NEUROSURGERY
AND NEUROLOGY

March 15, 1973

Honorable John R. Ottina
Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Commissioner Ottina:

As required by the Education of the Handicapped Act, P.L. 91-230, the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children has been made responsible for reviewing the administration and operation of the programs authorized by this act on behalf of handicapped children, youth, and adults. This report reflects the status of Federal programs in education for the handicapped and their relation to other public and private programs for handicapped children.

I should like to draw to your attention the concerns of parents, professionals and society as they seek to establish the rights of handicapped children to an education. Federal court actions in Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C. and elsewhere are mandating immediate redress to handicapped children who have been excluded from schools.

On behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children I am pleased to present this 1973 Annual Report.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. N. Crosby

Robert M. N. Crosby
Presiding Chairman
National Advisory Committee
on Handicapped Children

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children was authorized under the provisions of Public Law 89–750, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, which added a new Title VI, Education of Handicapped Children, to Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Under title VI, the U.S. Commissioner of Education was directed to establish within the Office of Education a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children.

In the spring of 1970 Congress passed Public Law 91–230 which, among its purposes, codifies major education legislation for the handicapped into the Education of the Handicapped Act. This new act continues to authorize the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children. It stipulates that the Committee:

> . . . shall review the administration and operation of the programs authorized by this title and other provisions of law administered by the Commissioner with respect to handicapped children, including their effect in improving the educational attainment of such children, and make recommendations for the improvement of such administration and operation with respect to such children. Such recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal programs for handicapped children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private programs for handicapped children. The Advisory Committee shall from time to time make such recommendations as it may deem appropriate to the Commissioner and shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Commissioner not later than March 31 of each year. The Commissioner shall transmit each such report to the Secretary together with his comments and recommendations, and the Secretary shall transmit such report, comments, and recommendations to the Congress together with any comments or recommendations he may have with respect thereto.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

as of June 30, 1973

Miss Catherine P. Breen
Corporate Training Director
Montgomery Ward & Company
619 West Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60607
*6/30/74

Dr. Frances P. Connor
Chairman, Department of
Special Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
*6/30/73

**Dr. Robert M. N. Crosby
1010 Saint Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
*6/30/73

Mrs. Phyllis Harper
Illinois School for the Deaf
125 Webster
Jacksonville, Illinois 62650
*6/30/75

Miss Maxine LaVerne Haywood
3106 Ben Wilson, #515
Victoria, Texas 77901
*6/30/73

Mrs. Peggy Johnstone
5628 Kendall Court
Arvada, Colorado 80002
*6/30/74

Mrs. Esther H. Levens
8601 Delmar Lane
Prairie Village, Kansas 66207
*6/30/73

Dr. Ruth P. Morris
3539 Glendale Avenue
Toledo, Ohio 43614
*6/30/74

Mrs. Louise M. Okie
2 Valley Forge Road
Darien, Connecticut 06820
*6/30/75

Dr. R. Elwood Pace
Coordinator, Special Education
Programs
1050 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
*6/30/73

Dr. Daniel Ringelheim
Deputy Assistant Commissioner
Branch of Special Education and
Pupil Personnel Services
State Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
*6/30/75

Sister Mary Serena Sheehy
Mother House Sisters of Charity
4200 South Fourth Street
Leavenworth, Kansas 66048
*6/30/74

Dr. Earl E. Walker
215 E. Locust
Harrisburg, Illinois 62946
*6/30/75

Mr. John Robinson West
Unionville, Pennsylvania 19375
*6/30/74

*Date appointment terminates
**Chairman

CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal iii
The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children v
Membership of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children as of June 30, 1973 vi
Introduction 1
Priority Recommendations 4
Review of Activities and Programs of the Education of the Handicapped Act, P.L. 91–230 5
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped 7
- Part B, Aid to State Education Agencies 7
- Part C, Centers and Services for Deaf/Blind Children 8
- Part C, Early Childhood Education Centers 8
- Part D, Professional Preparation 9
- Part E, Research and Demorstration 9
- Part F, Media Services and Captioned Films 10
- Part G, Learning Disabilities Centers 11

Issues and Recommendations for the Future for Education of the Handicapped 12
- New Legislation 12
- Accountability 13
- Financing 13
- Continuing Problems 14

Appendix A 16
Appendix B 17

INTRODUCTION

The right of handicapped children to an equal education is now being decided in the courts. The necessity for this court action has been brought about because the handicapped child has had a long and often painful struggle to obtain his place in the American classroom. Time and time again he has won his right to an education only to be pushed out by reorganizations and new sweeps of priorities which economize and eliminate the earmarked support programs which enable the handicapped child to achieve a basic education alongside his brothers and sisters.

The fight to make education for the handicapped child a priority has had some influence within the U.S. Office of Education since the 1929 White House Conference on Children. The early years of this struggle were devoted almost entirely to gathering of statistics and the publication of issues within the field of special education as well as "putting out fires" at the State and local levels as needs of handicapped children became critical. The early works provided a foundation for the expansion of programs for the handicapped.

In the late 1950's the needs of handicapped children became a national concern. Parent organizations brought to the attention of Congress and the White House the failure of local education agencies, State education agencies, and private schools to meet the needs of these children. There were many reasons for this crisis: (1) Better medical care saved and prolonged the lives of handicapped people, (2) families expected greater achievement on the part of the handicapped child to attain self-sufficiency, and (3) society accepted and opened up wider opportunities for sheltered and competitive employment of the handicapped.

The need to know more about these children and what they could and should learn became self-evident. In 1957 Congress appropriated one million dollars for cooperative research, $675,000 of which was earmarked for work in the education of retarded children. Under the administration of the Office of Education there continued to be specific designations for research with handicapped children for 2 years. The percentage designated for the retarded in 1957 was 61 and 54 in 1958. In 1963 only 5 percent of the research appropriation was made available for the handicapped.

Although handicapped children have been eligible to receive benefits from most legislation on a permissive basis, they have seldom been able to convince State and local decision-makers of their rights to share in these Federal programs. The Vocational Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are two examples of the failure of coverage for the handicapped. Statistics show that poor people are more likely to have a higher percentage of their population handicapped, yet very few programs and projects under ESEA or Vocational Education were designed to include the handicapped.

In 1958 Congress began to provide special legislation (P.L. 85–926) to prepare professional personnel in education of the retarded. In the same year they created authority for Captioned Films for the Deaf (P.L. 85–905). Shortly thereafter a law was enacted (P.L. 87–276) to train teachers of the deaf. By 1963 it became obvious that this legislation should not be a piecemeal program of fractionated categorical enactment of laws. Public Law 88–164 was a broad authority passed to permit coordination of professional preparation for all areas of the handicapped, with research programs for all handicapped categories. To administer this expanded program a Division of Handicapped Children and Youth was estab-

lished. President Kennedy appointed Dr. Samuel Kirk to head this new division. The coordination effort was almost immediately evident and Federal support grew from $1,000,000 in 1958 to $15,348,000 in 1964.

During the U.S. Office of Education's reorganization in 1965, the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth was disbanded. This action was taken despite a presidential citation in February 1965 for outstanding contributions to greater economy and improvement in government operations. Two months later the Division was the recipient of a superior service award by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In spite of the publicly acknowledged excellence of the administration of the program, its components were transferred to comparable general Office of Education functional units. Communication and coordination among research, training, and services for the handicapped was dissipated. As a consequence, the development of needed education of the handicapped was diminished and reduced in effectiveness. The lack of a visible and viable administration was sorely felt in the implementation of federally supported programs.

After lengthy deliberations and testimony before the House Ad Hoc Committee on the Handicapped, chaired by Congressman Hugh Carey, the Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Bill was introduced. The contents of this bill were added as amendments to the 1966 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In it was included a new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Office of Education, with a statutory National Advisory Committee required to make an annual report to Congress and to the people of the United States.

To assure efficient, economic, and effective Federal promotion of education for handicapped children an identifiable administrative unit reporting directly to the U.S. Commissioner of Education was established in 1967. The maintenance of such a tie remains of considerable interest to local, State, and regional administrators, to professional and parent organizations, and to the large number of relatives and friends of handicapped people throughout the country.

Soon after the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was formed, additional legislation earmarked set-asides in ESEA title I (P.L. 89–313), ESEA title III, and the Vocational Education Act for the handicapped. These programs are administered jointly by BEH and other bureaus within the Office of Education.

A series of additional authorities and amendments directed towards developing a comprehensive program for the handicapped have been enacted. Deaf/Blind Centers, Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance, Specific Learning Disabilities Centers, and other modifications have been able to extend the depth of the programs.

In January 1967, when the Bureau became an operational administrative unit of the Office of Education, the interests of the handicapped were placed in the central decisionmaking process of the Office of Education. This single act brought together all programs that were concerned with this special target population and brought to bear the energies of the Federal Government to assure an equal opportunity for all handicapped children.

In 1969, in response to President Nixon's call for coordinated and consolidated programs, the various legislation authorities for the education of the handicapped were restructured into a new law (P.L. 91–230), the Education of the Handicapped Act. This is the basic authority for the programs for the handicapped and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Concurrently, efforts are being made to revise some of the traditional discrete disability categories which have limited service: 1) more direct focus on the educational needs of severely and multiply handicapped children; 2) specific programs to return children, unnecessarily labeled and academically underestimated, to the mainstream of education; 3) more rigorous and earlier educational assessment of children with developmental problems and aberrations; 4) educational intervention to promote effective learning in vulnerable infants and very young children without reference to a specific disability.

Table I shows the growth of funding from 1964 to 1974. In addition to these monies, the set-aside funds in ESEA title I and title III, plus the Vocational Education Act, account for another 115 to 120 million dollars annually.

In April 1971 U.S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland, in a filmed presentation before the national meeting of the Council

Table I

Year	*Budget Estimate to Congress*	*House Allowance*	*Senate Allowance*	*Appropriation*
1964	$ 15,384,000	$ 15,384,000	$ 15,384,000	$ 15,384,000
1965	17,884,000	17,884,000	17,884,000	17,884,000
1966	28,300,000	28,300,000	28,300,000	28,300,000
1967	37,900,000	37,875,000	37,875,000	37,875,000
1968	53,400,000	53,400,000	58,400,000	52,650,000
1969	84,650,000	78,850,000	78,850,000	78,850,000
1970	85,850,000	100,000,000	105,000,000	84,575,000
1971	94,450,000	104,400,000	104,400,000	104,400,000
1972	104,250,000	109,250,000	110,750,000	110,000,000
1973	131,019,000	143,519,000	181,769,000	143,519,000
1974	* 93,609,000			

*Part B funds 37.5 million are proposed to be transferred to Special Education revenue sharing; these amounts for 1964 through 1973 reflect comparability with the 1974 estimate.

of Exceptional Children in Miami, Fla., called for a new national priority for education of all handicapped children by 1980. This filmed presentation was distributed to all State departments of education and used on local and national television programs. Soon after this call for action by the Commissioner, the Education Commission of the States, composed of governors, State legislators, and State and local administrators, adopted education of the handicapped as one of its major priorities for the seventies. Many governors have mentioned the education of the handicapped as a State priority for their state of the State messages. Recently such States as Missouri, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have allocated revenue sharing funds dispersed to the States in December of 1972 to programs for the handicapped.

It is important at this time to restate the challenge and charge given by Commissioner Marland in the spring of 1971. The Commissioner called for a renewed mutual effort by the States and Federal Government to assure:

- That every handicapped child is receiving an appropriately designed education by 1980 (85 percent by 1978).
- That by the year 1977, every handicapped child who leaves school has had career educational training that is relevant to the job market, meaningful to his career aspirations, and realistic to his fullest potential.
- The enrollment by 1978 of 850,000 (85 percent) preschool-age handicapped children in Federal, State, and local educational day care.
- That all handicapped children served in the schools have sufficient trained personnel who are competent in the skills required to aid the child in reaching his full potential.
- The most severely handicapped children and youth to become as independent as possible, thereby reducing their requirements for institutional care and providing opportunity for self-development.

PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. WE REAFFIRM THE RIGHT UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION OF *ALL* HANDICAPPED CHILDREN TO A TAX-SUPPORTED AND APPROPRIATE EDUCATION REGARDLESS OF THEIR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL CAPABILITIES.

2. WE RECOMMEND MAINTENANCE AND STRENGTHENING OF A POPULATION-TARGETED ADMINISTRATION UNIT WHICH COORDINATES PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL AND CARRIES OUT ALL FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED, INCLUDING SERVICE, PERSONNEL PREPARATION, RESEARCH, AND TECHNOLOGY. EFFECTIVE FEDERAL FISCAL CONTRIBUTION IS ESSENTIAL TO IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

3. WE RECOMMEND THAT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AND EARMARKED FOR THIS PURPOSE.

4. WE RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING ITEMS BE INCLUDED IN ANY LONG-TERM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GOALS OF EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED:

A. All children in America are entitled to an equal educational opportunity which is appropriate to his or her level of ability.

B. Every State should develop the details and procedures of a plan of education for all handicapped persons.

C. Procedures for testing, assessment, identification, and periodic reports of progress shall be free of racial, cultural, sex, or other discriminatory practices. Frequent assessments of all handicapped children shall confirm the appropriateness of such programs.

D. Regular educational environments, i.e., neighborhood schools, hospital schools, special schools and classes, and intensive educational care units shall be made available for placement of handicapped children.

E. Families, guardians, handicapped youth and adults, as well as other citizens from the community at large, should participate as an integral part of the planning and operation of these programs.

F. When there are differences among the various parties, i.e., parents, handicapped people and school authorities, due process procedure should be available to assure that an equal educational opportunity is available for all handicapped children.

G. For all Federal funds intended for basic educational programs for the handicapped the State education agency shall be the sole recipient and be administered by its special education unit. In addition, approved special projects and demonstrations may be awarded directly to State education agencies, local education agencies, private agencies, and colleges and universities. Federal funds administered by the SEA must arrange to extend the benefits of such funds to handicapped children attending private schools.

5. WE COMMEND THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED FOR INSISTING UPON QUALITY CONTROL OF ALL PROGRAMS FUNDED BY USOE FOR THE HANDICAPPED AND RECOMMEND THAT THEY EXERCISE CONTINUED LEADERSHIP IN THE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF SUCH PROGRAMS.

6. WE RECOMMEND THE IMMEDIATE EXTENSION OF THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT (P.L. 91–230) AND CONSIDER IT ESSENTIAL TO CONTINUATION OF FULL SERVICES TO ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN.

7. THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN CALLS FOR A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE HANDICAPPED NOT LATER THAN 1976 SO THAT NO HANDICAPPED CHILD SHALL REMAIN FORGOTTEN OR NEGLECTED AS THIS NATION MOVES INTO ITS THIRD CENTURY OF PROGRESS AND HOPE FOR ALL PEOPLE.

REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS OF THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT P.L. 91–230

At the beginning of fiscal year 1973 the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children had a membership of 14 people. Dr. Robert M. N. Crosby was appointed chairman by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In November of 1972 Dr. Frank B. Withrow was appointed executive secretary and support staff was assigned to work with the Committee. Mrs. Catherine C. Purnell and Mrs. Linda Kinney are staff assistants and Mrs. Dorothy Proctor is the secretary.

Four regular meetings of the committee were held during fiscal year 1973, on August 3–5, 1972; November 13–15, 1972; February 1–3, 1973; and June 6–7, 1973. Also, the National Advisory Committee has provided a forum for parents, professionals, and other interested citizens in which they might interact with committee members at a series of national conventions concerned with the handicapped.

This report will endeavor to touch upon the New Federalism that President Nixon is establishing in his second administration. A brief history of the evolution of Federal programs for the handicapped will be included as background for this New Federalism. Since 1967, the programs for the handicapped have been moving towards more accountability, reduction of dependency for handicapped people, and institutional reform.

Highlights of Fiscal Year 1973

The efficiency and effectiveness of the program planning, policy staff, and the implementation by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped of these procedures is a reflection of the seriousness with which the staff regards long-range planning. The intensive efforts of the planning staff have enabled the Bureau to work effectively across agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These planning activities have also been extended to mutual plans between the Bureau and State education agencies. The Aid to States Branch has, during the past 4 years, provided technical assistance to States so that all activities for the handicapped will be interlocked and child centered. The main objective of this activity in 1973 is the development of procedures for third-party evaluations of projects and programs funded within the States. Such interaction among States and the Bureau encourage development of plans that are mutually evolved and activated. The goal of such technical assist-

ance is to focus on the needs of the handicapped child regardless of his location within a State or the source of funds to be used to reduce the barriers to his learning. Such an approach brings together multi-disciplined resources and institutions in a complementary rather than a duplicative effort. All are directed towards the reduction of dependency on the part of the handicapped child and his entry into regular education programs when that is possible.

Professional Preparation

The Bureau adopted a new procedure for funding the development of professional personnel. It provides for greater flexibility on the part of colleges and universities in strengthening their special education departments, increasing the numbers of students preparing to work with handicapped children, and advancing existing staff participation in professional preparation and up-dating of skills. It also requires an evaluation of the effectiveness of the training which includes a follow-up on graduates of such programs. The new funding format encourages the retraining of surplus regular teachers and the recruitment of outstanding young people to work with the handicapped.

Unlike general education, education of the handicapped still has an unmet manpower need. A recent study of this need indicates that there is still a shortage of more than 250,000 teachers. It also assumes that existing patterns of intervention will remain stable. Other efforts between the training and research divisions may discover new means of intervention that call for a different use of manpower which would modify the numbers and kinds of professionals required.

Telecommunications

A special note of interest in the educational technology area was the captioning of President Nixon's inaugural address for the deaf. For some years the Bureau has been working towards captioning of the news at the time it is broadcast. This is the first example of such a program. Additional efforts are being made with the Public Broadcasting Service and WGBH of Boston to provide as much as 1500 minutes of captioned television for the deaf this season.

The use of television for other areas of handicapped children is also beginning to appear. The Federal Communication Commission has informed all broadcast facilities that they must include coverage for all elements of the society. Public stations are especially required to serve the needs of the society with respect to minority groups. In a memorandum to all broadcasters the FCC pointed out that handicapped people are a minority group, and as such should have special programs designed for, about, and by them.

The inclusion of handicapped people as a part of a normal story line in general television programing this season has been more accurate and in greater quantity. "Sesame Street," "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood," and "Zoom" are all programs that have had handicapped people as a part of their regular show.

"What Shall We Do For Thursday's Child?" was a special 90-minute program on the rights of the handicapped child to an equal education. This program originated in Philadelphia and was transmitted to all 232 Public Broadcast Service stations across the Nation. All of the major cities rebroadcast the show and many cities added local programing that called attention to the issues concerning education of the handicapped in their community.

Under Public Law 91–230 the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is charged with the administration of all parts of the Education of the Handicapped Act. It is also required to coordinate activities with other agencies when the education of handicapped children is involved. Coordination with other agencies specifically involves ESEA title I (P.L. 89–313), ESEA title III, the Vocational Education Act of 1968, Head Start, and Child Advocacy programs. This report will summarize the main points of interest under each part of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

Part B, Aid to State Education Agencies

During recent years Part B has funded about 2,000 projects which provided part of the educational service for 300,000 handicapped children annually at a cost of $37,500,000 per year. State and local resources continued 500 or more of these projects which were initiated by Federal funds each year. In a substantial number of programs there is an immediate expansion of the activities as they are replicated throughout the State. Excellent ideas and programs are frequently transported across State lines and duplicated in adjacent States.

This program not only serves as a catalyst for demonstration projects but brings together many different agencies and professional disciplines within States to coordinate local, State, and Federal fiscal resources to serve handicapped children. Frequently this cooperative effort was the first time that such inter- and intra-agency communication and coordination has occurred. Since the inception of the program in 1967, State education agency leadership staffs in special education have tripled in number. In some States no personnel were assigned to this area of education prior to 1967 and consequently almost no programs were offered for handicapped children. In the school year 1964–65 there were 180 special education specialists employed in SEA's and in 1972–73, 371 specialists were employed. These enlarged and better trained staffs have undertaken comprehensive long-range planning efforts directed towards full service programs. State advisory committees have been formed in almost every State to assist with this planning. These committees include experts from local schools, colleges and universities, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, health agencies, and residential schools. The Bureau requires that there be a sharing of plans with the public and that there exist a range of services from residential schools to integration of handicapped children into regular education programs in the local school system.

A better understanding of the effect of this act can be seen in table II, which breaks out children served and monies expended by handicap.

Table II

FUNDS EXPENDED, BY TYPE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED; UNDER PART B, EHA; P.L. 89–313; TITLE III, ESEA; AND THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT FISCAL YEAR 1971

Type of Handicap	*Funds Expended*	*Number of Children Served*
Trainable Mentally Retarded	$ 27,050,007	122,760
Educable Mentally Retarded	44,435,853	324,777
Learning Disabled	10,210,496	58,442
Emotionally Disturbed	14,467,346	84,439
Other Health Impaired	5,704,420	23,004
Crippled	3,237,589	23,409
Visually Impaired	5,204,166	30,302
Deaf	10,379,537	38,577
Hard of Hearing	6,167,349	46,227
Speech Impaired	5,615,557	167,501
TOTAL	$132,472,320	919,438

Table III indicates the distribution of activities on which funds were expended. As indicated in this table, more than 70 percent of the funds go directly into instructional activities for children.

Table III

FUNDS EXPENDED, BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE UNDER PART B, EHA; P.L. 89-313 FISCAL YEAR 1971

Type of Expenditure	*Amount Expended*	*Percent Expended*
Instruction	$57,520,680	71.8
Administration	6,918,176	8.6
Fixed Charges	4,402,359	5.5
Equipment for Instruction	4,018,618	5.0
Pupil Transportation	1,486,076	1.9
Health Services	1,058,687	1.3
All Other Equipment	947,038	1.2
Student Body Activities	713,817	.9
Operation of Plant	524,519	.6
Maintenance of Plant	366,649	.5
Community Services	403,038	.5
Food Services	412,779	.5
Remodeling	320,519	.4
Buildings	194,260	.2
Attendance Services	779,427	.1
TOTAL	$80,129,772	100

Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act is the focal point for planning and coordination of activities for all Federal, State, and local programs. In fiscal year 1971, 180,000 handicapped children received some benefits from ESEA title III and 209,000 were a part of the Vocational Education Acts program. A considerable amount of BEH staff time was spent in coordinating these efforts for the handicapped at the Federal, State, and local levels. Since 1971, 85 percent of ESEA title III has been administered at the State level through DHEW regional offices. All of Vocational Education is administered through the regional offices.

Coordination with the Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education has been very active this year. Clarification of guidelines and the definition of the handicapped were emphasized in workshops. Some States appointed personnel who jointly worked in the Vocational Education Department and the Special Education Division. A nationwide effort was made to encourage the inclusion of the more severely handicapped student in these programs. Efforts are being made to assure that all States can identify by name the handicapped student and service he receives. In many States a mutual plan is being developed among special education, vocational rehabilitation, and vocational education so that duplication of effort is minimized.

Three national conferences were developed in career education. The largest was a joint conference in New Orleans in February 1973, sponsored by the Council for Exceptional Children and the American Vocational Education Association. Some 1200 professionals from both areas of expertise attended this conference. Also in New Orleans, a conference on career education for the blind was held. A symposium on career education for the deaf was sponsored by the University of Nebraska's Regional Media Center for the Deaf.

The strongest overall coordination activity which the Bureau has been able to use is the Projected Activity Report required under Part B of this Act. This requires all States to be at least aware of what is happening in each of these areas.

Part C, Centers and Services for Deaf/Blind Children

There are 10 regional deaf/blind centers serving children throughout the 50 States and other areas. These centers subcontract with more than 100 local resources to provide diagnostic, counseling, and educational services to deaf/blind children and their families. It is now estimated that there are about 5,000 deaf/blind children in the United States. Slightly less than one-third of these children received full-time educational services this year. Almost 400 deaf/blind children attended day programs within their local community. Almost 1,000 children received service in residential schools. Additional work was done on a short-term basis of emergency care for children and their families as they waited for full-time service.

The Committee noted that much improvement has taken place over the past year, but that there are still many of these children lost in the back wards of hospitals or sitting at home without any education being offered them. These children are the results of the rubella epidemic of 1964–65 and are now 8, 9, and 10 years old. Time is rapidly running out for them to be a part of the human race. Every effort must be made to continue to search for these children and to provide an education for them.

Part C, Early Childhood Education Centers

The Federal Model Early Childhood Education Centers have stimulated the growth of

similar programs so that an estimated 100,000 handicapped children received some early education this year. This is compared to a handful of early experimental programs as late as 1965 which served less than 10,000 preschool handicapped children. Almost 100 percent of the projects funded under this part of the Act are eventually continued through the use of State, local, or private funds. For some handicapped children education should begin in infancy. Specific work with both the child and his parents must start early. Where there is a high risk factor known, the parents' work may begin during the pregnancy.

This year the Bureau and the Office of Child Development funded six projects to demonstrate the efficacy of handicapped children being served in Head Start programs. Such programs are helpful to both the handicapped and nonhandicapped child in that they provide a wider range of experiences for each child. This joint effort is in response to the 1972 congressional mandate which requires the Office of Child Development to include handicapped children as a part of the population it serves within Head Start programs. The Committee commends Congress for this mandate.

Part D, Professional Preparation

Unlike general education, education of handicapped children has no surplus of professional workers. To meet this continuing need the Bureau has moved to a changed procedure for developing required manpower. The new procedure provides for more freedom and flexibility on the part of the college and university to meet the needs for professional preparation. Stipends are no longer automatically provided as a part of student support. In addition, students are allowed to work as graduate assistants. The net effect of these changes is to increase the strength of the special education department within the college or university, allow for new and nontraditional models of training to be developed, attract a larger number of students into this field, and encourage colleges and universities to plan cooperatively their programs in conjunction with State education agencies and local communities.

The new procedure requires a greater degree of accountability on the part of the college or university. Each program develops a system to evaluate the effects of its training and follow students through to their eventual employment within programs for the handicapped.

A relatively new aspect is the training of physical educators and recreational personnel. Three years ago almost no training of such personnel included work with the handicapped. Today 226 students are enrolled in 32 colleges and universities and are being trained specifically to work in this area. Additional short-term workshops are providing inservice training to staff already employed in programs for the handicapped. Year-round activities in physical education and recreation for the handicapped are becoming part of the regular opportunities offered in many programs for the handicapped.

The Committee is most encouraged with the new procedures established in the development of manpower needs and commends the Bureau for the action it has taken in this area.

Part E, Research and Demonstration

The Committee is aware of the development of the National Institute of Education and its efforts in research; however, *IT STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT THE PART E PROGRAM OF RESEARCH UNDER THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT CONTINUE TO BE ADMINISTERED IN THE BUREAU.* The Committee feels that the concentrated effort on the targeted population of the handicapped has allowed for a rapid and orderly transfer of knowledge into action.

The current year's activities have been designed around the priorities set down by the Bureau. Major efforts are being made to validate the cost effectiveness of educational interventions and to test new educational procedures used within the field.

Project PRIME is a joint endeavor of BEH and the Texas Education Agency designed to investigate what factors make a difference in the social, emotional, and academic growth of exceptional children.

Briefly stated, the problem to which this research is directed is generic to the entire field of special education. There is considerable evidence to suggest an ongoing impetus on the part of State education agencies toward re-evaluat-

ing the appropriateness of special class placement for handicapped children. An examination of the Projected Activities Report submitted by each State education agency to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped for the fiscal year 1973, related to EHA, Part B and P.L. 89–313, reveals that over 50 percent of the States' listed activities related to integration of handicapped children into mainstream education as a major problem and objective. There is every reason to believe that special education is reexamining its reliance upon self-contained special classes (particularly for the EMR, ED and LD child) and moving toward increased reintegration in the regular classes. If, as Hanushek (1970) suggests, based on analysis of Coleman's (1966) data, schools appear to be expending funds on the wrong things, it would seem imperative that special education be concerned with identification of the factors that make a difference for handicapped children. Therefore every effort should be made to identify the relevant pedagogical variables which maximize the successful adjustment and growth of handicapped children in regular classes. There appears to be an urgent need for: a) a description of those variables (i.e., input and process) which appear most relevant to the prediction of successful outcomes; b) the development of specific intervention programs delivered to regular classrooms or related sociological systems (i.e., peers, family, etc.) which have potential for maximizing successful outcomes; c) the experimental validation, through methodologically sound design, of promising intervention packages; and d) the evaluation of those variables within intervention packages which account for their success. The inauguration of the new Texas legislation and its obvious national implications have provided a unique opportunity to pursue these problems. This project will attempt to answer some of these questions.

Within the Bureau this project in research was stimulated by the close interaction between service and research programs. Such interactions among research, training, services, and technology clearly enables the national research effort to be directed towards removing barriers to full services for all handicapped children. This close interaction allows new knowledge to be transferred into action at optimum speed.

Part F, Media Services and Captioned Films

The most significant activity of the current year was the awarding, through a highly competitive process, of the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped to Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The first year of this award is developmental in nature and designed to allow for staffing and operational organization of the center. The Committee wishes to commend the center for its recruitment policy in seeking qualified women, minority groups, and handicapped professionals to staff its programs.

When fully operational, the center will be a capstone to the learning resources systems funded by the Bureau. It should interact with the Special Education Instructional Material Centers, Regional Media Centers, Regional Resource Centers, and other educational technology efforts to assure that there is a common exchange of information on techniques and materials used by the handicapped.

As noted under "Telecommunications," Captioned Films for the Deaf has expanded its television efforts this year. Television is a cost effective means of bringing a wider range of educational and cultural programs to the deaf. There are two systems of captioning television which are currently being explored. One system broadcasts so that all television receivers will receive the captioned version of the program over open broadcast systems. The other system requires a special attachment on the home television set to receive the captioned program. In this latter system only those sets with the special attachments will be able to receive the subtitled programs, while all others will receive the program as it is normally broadcast. This system is being developed through a joint effort among the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Public Broadcasting Service, and the National Bureau of Standards. In addition to these conventional broadcast methods of providing captioned television to deaf audiences, exploration is being made with respect to the use of cable television for the deaf.

Educational technology programs are expanding in all areas of Media Services and Captioned Films activities. Through close cooperation with the major television programs for children, handicapped children are beginning to be included as a target group in their programs. For example a deaf girl, Linda Bove,

an actress with the National Theatre for the Deaf, lives on "Sesame Street." Scheduled for this season are some orthopedically handicapped children who will appear in wheel chairs on "Sesame Street." "Zoom" has had blind children appearing as guest experts on the show. "Vision On," a program developed specifically for deaf children or language-handicapped children, has been brought to this country.

"Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood" is emphasizing the handicapped child as a target population for this season. In this program, efforts are made to develop sensitivity in young viewers to the differences among people.

Part G, Learning Disabilities Centers

In this program the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has sought to establish statewide models of programs for teaching disabled children. Seventeen additional grants were awarded this year to make a total of 40 States that have received grants for this purpose. In some of the grantee States new laws have been passed that establish specific learning disabilities as a part of the laws concerning the handicapped. In such States this usually means that professionals are hired within State departments of education who can provide leadership to the State in developing guidelines and services for these children. All of the grants in this category require that provisions be made to extend the program beyond the demonstration stage.

Most of the grants are concerned with elementary-age children; however, some States such as Ohio have designed programs at the secondary level. These projects provide individualized assistance which allows a pupil to have the support required to achieve in either an academic or vocational program.

A Leadership Training Institute has been established at the University of Arizona. This grant provides technical assistance to all of the current grantees and to potential grantees. It is the central focus of this national program and as such brings together manpower resources from a multi-disciplined background to give direction so that duplication of effort is held to a minimum and new knowledge is rapidly assimilated by the schools and professionals serving these children.

Grants Awarded in 1971:

California	New Jersey	Washington
Colorado	Ohio	Wisconsin
Mississippi	Utah	Arizona (University of)

Grants Awarded in 1972:

Alaska	Michigan	Rhode Island
Arizona	Nebraska	Texas
Georgia	New Mexico	Virginia
Iowa	Pennsylvania	West Virginia
Kansas	Puerto Rico	Wyoming

New Grants (LD) tentatively scheduled to begin July 1973, as funds become available:

Idaho	BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs)	South Carolina
Nevada	Massachusetts	Maryland
Oregon	North Dakota	North Carolina
Arkansas	Alabama	New York
Delaware	Kentucky	Oklahoma
Louisiana	South Dakota	Maine
Florida	Connecticut	Missouri

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE FUTURE FOR EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

The Committee is deeply concerned with the expiration of Public Law 91–230 on the thirtieth of June 1973. Failure to extend this legislation would jeopardize all the accomplishments on behalf of the handicapped children that have been made in the past years (see appendix B, letter to the Commissioner of Education). The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was formed to plan for this neglected target population. This is economically, administratively, and procedurally sound. The continuation of an organization with a strong, broad, Federal focus, with policy access at the highest levels of DHEW, is essential to insure continuation of the many services to the handicapped provided during the last 4 years.

New Legislation

In the second Nixon Administration it is likely that new legislation in the area of the education of the handicapped will be enacted and financial support appropriated. In developing such legislation there are a number of factors which should be included:

1. *Rights of the Handicapped*

Each handicapped child must be guaranteed the right to a tax-supported appropriate education. This education must be of high quality and must fit the needs and abilities of each child, no matter the degree of handicap.

2. *State Plan*

There must be a State plan which documents the procedures for insuring that such tax-supported appropriate education will be available by a specified date. It should include a timetable for accomplishing education for all handicapped children and acquiring the necessary facilities, personnel, and services. In addition, each State must make an effort to find all handicapped children within its boundaries. The guarantee of an appropriate education is of no value if it is not carried to its fullest extent. All handicapped children residing within a State must be identified and the procedure for entering the system must be made clear and available to parents.

3. *Plan for Each Child and Due Process*

The State, through the local education agency, should have a plan developed for each child which has been agreed upon by the parents or guardians of the child. This statement should include the level of educational performance at the time of entry, a statement of long-range goals for the education of the child and the method by which these goals are to be obtained, as well as a statement of the specific services which will be provided, including the dates of initiation and anticipated duration of these services. This program should be reviewed at least annually and amended when necessary with the approval and agreement of the parents or guardian of the child. Due process procedures must be available which will allow notification of parents or guardian of the child when the education agency proposes to change the plan or placement of the child. There must be an opportunity for the parents or guardian to obtain a fair and impartial hearing, to examine all records with respect to classification or placement of the child, and to obtain an independent evaluation of the child, if desired.

4. *Nondiscriminatory Testing*

All tests or other evaluation procedures used for the purpose of classification or determining the level of a child's educational performance must be neither racially, culturally, sexually, or otherwise discriminatory.

5. *Assessment of Performance*

The child's performance in such an educational plan must be assessed at frequent intervals in order to assure the effectiveness of the program in meeting the needs of the handicapped child.

6. *Range of Program*

There must be a diversity of alternative program placement. This includes all ranges of educational intervention from neighborhood schools, hospital schools, and special class placement, to homebound and intensive educational care units.

7. *Citizen Participation*

Citizen participation, whether it be on the part of a parent of a handicapped child or on the part of a handicapped adult, in program planning and operation must be an integral part of all State and local educational organizations

8. *Administration and Supervision*

The State education agency shall be the recipient of Federal funds designated for the direct education of the handicapped children. This agency will be responsible for administering and/or supervising the preparation and administration of the State plan. All educational programs for handicapped children within the State will be supervised by the persons responsible for educational programs for handicapped children within the State education agency. All educational programs for handicapped children within the State shall meet the educational standards of the State education agency. Procedures for extending direct educational services to handicapped children attending private schools shall be developed.

Accountability

There is increasing insistence on accountability—financial, as well as programmatic. This is to be commended. The Bureau and field have always taken a very positive stand on the evaluation of funded programs and should be commended for this, as well as encouraged to continue leadership in the assessment of performance of programs at Federal, State, and local levels. Such emphasis on accountability, however, should not interfere with the advancement of programs for the handicapped. The apparent collision between advocacy and accountability should be prevented. A group needing service should not threaten those who are already in the system receiving service. We cannot discontinue our present programs, nor can we fail to include in them the approximately four million handicapped children not being served, until such time as specific and detailed evaluation of programs can be made. Evaluation can be, and should be, an ongoing process that leads to the expansion of services to all handicapped children in the United States.

On the other hand, the expansion of services to encompass all those not now being served should not replace the effort to improve the programs already in existence. A program goal should be established for each child, and some measure of accomplishment of this goal should be documented at regular intervals at the local level and monitored by the State. Only by combining advocacy and accountability will we insure that all handicapped children are placed in an educational program with the assurance that there will be a high quality of education appropriate to the child's ability.

Fiscal as well as programmatic accountability shall be the responsibility of both local and State education agencies. Methods of insuring accountability of both varieties shall be an integral part of the State plan for the education of the handicapped child. Documentation of performance in the areas of finance and program shall be made by report at frequent intervals to the designated Federal organization responsible for management and administration of programs for the handicapped.

Financing

There is an enlarged need for Federal funds devoted to the education of handicapped children. This need arises for several reasons: (1) Increased numbers of children are coming under special educational responsibilities; (2) legal actions and legislation in the States have mandated education for all children; and (3) available resources are restricted by judicial regulation of tax revenues derived from property taxation for the purposes of education. In addition, the expansion of other services outside the education area in every State is placing greater burdens on the financial resources of local governments. These limitations restrict total income so that we find an increasing gap between need and provision of services in education of the handicapped. The education of the handicapped child should in this cost-resource squeeze be given special consideration because it is the most vulnerable service provided by the State. When seeking a method of reducing a State budget, services offered to handicapped children are frequently the first to suffer. In many localities, special educational programs are already feeling the cost squeeze which has become almost endemic to our urban areas.

That it is in the national interest to prevent

deterioration of education of the handicapped is testified to by the later impact of these failures in education upon the community. The 1968 Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders implicates the failure of special education as a significant origin of serious community disruption.

In addition to the great financial need of various communities which arises from a limited income and tax base as well as an increasing need for services, there is the additional disproportionate need between one community and another. Where facilities are adequate for education of the handicapped, there is migration of families to that area. This then places an undue burden upon certain localities. The migration of families from one State to another to gain special educational opportunities has become an accepted fact of life. It places an unfair burden on some communities, penalizing them for providing proper education for the handicapped, while rewarding other communities which are unwilling to assume their responsibilities. Thus the education of handicapped children must be treated as a Federal problem, over and above the ordinary educational responsibilities of the States. Federal funds must be provided.

Previously, the Federal Government has given special education financing to State programs, but not as a permanent subsidy. The cost of education of the handicapped must be shared by the Federal Government on a permanent basis, rather than a temporary one. There are many collective national priorities, such as defense, environmental protection, and cancer research. There is now a necessity for Federal support of special education from the standpoint of State fiscal incapability as well as the disastrous later impact on communities if programs for the handicapped fail.

There is an historical precedent for the entry of the Federal Government into permanent funding. Washington assumed the responsibility for the education and financing of the deaf/blind, one group of handicapped children. It now becomes necessary to expend this scope and include all handicapped children under this national priority.

Whatever method this financing makes use of is not particularly relevant to this Committee's activity. Such funding, whether it be in an outright payment to States or through the vehicle of revenue sharing, must be categorized specifically for the education of the handicapped. There must be limited flexibility in this identification in order that the target population may be adequately served. It is also essential that a percentile formula for measuring the share to be received for education of the handicapped not be used, but that specific dollar amounts be appropriated. The percentile method fixes for all time the relative position of all subgroups and an increase to one group cannot be made except at the expense of other groups.

Continuing Problems

1. Failure to provide educational services for handicapped children will result in an increasing battle within the courts. Class-action suits are currently pending in 21 different States. Equitable procedures and programs must evolve through the educational institutions. The final responsibility is with the educators to implement such programs.

2. The efficient use of existing professional personnel mandates that cooperative planning among local, State, Federal, and private agencies, and colleges and universities must be more sharply defined than in the past. The Bureau has made a beginning towards long-range planning but the overall picture still remains fragmented.

3. Financing of general education is undergoing a major revolution in this Nation. Education of the handicapped must develop techniques for maintaining parity in such a shifting situation. The economics of scale factor is a major problem. Who will pay for and administer programs for low-incidence populations of handicapped children?

4. Coordination among disciplines that are concerned with the handicapped has improved; however, education, medical, social, rehabilitation, and welfare agencies still function as separate and sometimes disparate institutions.

5. Institutional reform has begun; however, education of the handicapped remains one of the most labor-intense activities in education. New knowledge and new techniques must constantly be explored if efficiency is to be increased and education is to move into the electronic age. Cost reductions will be possible only when the intensity of the use of highly

trained professionals is reduced. New roles for professionals and paraprofessionals must be developed.

6. Communication of new knowledge and techniques so that they become an active part of the local school system is still a major problem. It requires new and bold approaches to bring to more than 135,000 practicing special educators the findings of research and demonstration projects. More than 60 percent of the employed staff do not meet the minimum State certification requirements.

7. Prevention of complicating factors can be reduced by early infant and child education programs. Major new shifts in community responsibility and in some instances State laws must be changed if these programs are to become universally available to all handicapped children and their families.

8. Major reforms in professional preparation programs must be enacted to respond to court decisions that demand immediate action. The handicapped child is now the responsibility not only of the special educator, but also of the general educator. All teacher preparation must include techniques for working with the handicapped child.

9. Career education is not yet a fact for every handicapped youth. Programs must be established that enable every handicapped youth to be prepared to enter the world of work. Continuing education programs need to be developed that allow handicapped people to expand their work skills and potential abilities throughout their lives.

10. Major commitments of resources must become a part of local, State, and Federal agencies responsible for administration of education programs for the handicapped. Shortages of required staff to operate, administer, and plan such programs are not commensurate with funds allocated nor the programmatic charge given to such administrative units. This shortage continues to plague these new organizational units in all programs and at all levels. This lack of sufficient quantity and quality of staff is in the long run wasteful of both human and financial resources.

11. Programmatic specialist, economic specialist, legislative specialist, and administrative specialist must develop a decisionmaking process that is child centered and cost efficient both in terms of short-term gains and long-range effects upon local, State, and Federal resources.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

February 21, 1973

Dr. Robert M. N. Crosby
Chairman
National Advisory Committee
on Handicapped Children
Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Dr. Crosby:

Thank you for your letter of February 5 on behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children concerning the expiration of the Education for the Handicapped Act.

I am in accord with the Council's assessment of the importance of the education of handicapped children. I can assure the Council that every effort is being made by the Administration to insure timely action on legislation relating to the education of handicapped children.

President Nixon's budget already reflects the decision to continue the Federal commitment to the education of handicapped children in Fiscal Year 1974. The funds will be made available through legislation to be proposed which will authorize continuation of the activities currently authorized under the discretionary parts of the Education of the Handicapped Act and the inclusion of State grant funds in the Education Revenue Sharing proposal. P.L. 89-313 funds (now included section 103 of Title I ESEA) will also be included in the ERS Area of Assistance for the Handicapped.

The details of the Administration's legislative proposals for education are now being finalized and will be submitted in time to permit Congressional deliberations before July 1, 1973. Once the proposals are submitted, of course, it will be the Congress which will determine the schedule for consideration.

Sincerely,

John Ottina

John Ottina
Acting U.S. Commissioner
of Education

APPENDIX B

R. M. N. CROSBY, M. D.
1010 ST. PAUL STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202

VERNON 7-0404

PEDIATRIC NEUROSURGERY
AND NEUROLOGY

February 5, 1973

Dr. John R. Ottina
Acting Commissioner of Education
Room 4181-D, FOB 6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Commissioner Ottina:

The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children is deeply concerned about the future of the USOE programs for the handicapped. We feel that the June, 1973 expiration date for P.L. 91-230, Education for the Handicapped Act, calls for immediate action in order to assure the continued and efficient management of the program for which we have assumed advisory responsibilities.

We are aware of the recent history and current status of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1972 with the pocket veto and the subsequent inability to appropriate the later authorized $60 million supplemental. It would seem to be urgent that some legislative action be taken on the provisions for the education of the handicapped prior to the regular expiration date in June, 1973 so that a similar circumstance does not occur.

The continued existence of a viable administrative unit in the USOE is particularly critical in light of the strong demands for accountability through greatly increased state legislation and judicial decisions. Anticipated funding problems through lack of a unified fiscal pattern and the contemplated changes as recommended in the 1974 Budget, i.e. the Aid to States makes it necessary to begin discussion of this legislation now. These factors appears to threaten the existence of an identifiable administrative unit with policy access as is now the case with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

The Committee would appreciate information on USOE's plans relative to the introduction of a bill, the holding of hearings, and the implementation of legislation for the renewal of the Education of the Handicapped Act prior to the regular expiration data of P.L. 91-230.

Cordially yours,

Robert M. N. Crosby

Robert M. N. Crosby
Chairman
National Advisory Committee
on Handicapped Children

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1973 O - 506-661